

REMARKS

The Office Action of December 6, 2004, and the Advisory Action of March 22, 2005, have been considered by the Applicants. Claims 1, 9, 27, 28, 30, and 31 have been amended. Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 2, as indefinite. Applicants traverse the rejection. The claim has been amended to recite that the matrix is present based on the weight of the polymer coating. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-6, 9-21, 23, 24, and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Drappel (US 6,391,509). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Drappel does not teach all limitations of independent claims 1, 27, 28, and 30. For example, in the specification on page 10, lines 5-9, the Applicants teach a carrier wherein the conductive polymer is present in an amount of from about 0.1 to about 5 weight percent based on the weight of the polymer coating. Amended claims 1, 27, 28, and 30 all recite this limitation. In contrast, Drappel teaches a carrier wherein the conductive polymer is present in an amount of from about 5 to about 70 weight percent based on the weight of the polymer coating. Furthermore, the examples of Drappel all contain a polymer coating wherein the conductive polymer is more than 10 weight percent of the coating. Therefore, Drappel does not anticipate the instant claims or their dependent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 7, 8, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Drappel. Applicants traverse the rejections.

As discussed above, Drappel does not teach all claim limitations. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Drappel in view of Viswanathan (US 6,764,617). Applicants traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, Drappel does not teach all claim limitations. Viswanathan does not correct this deficiency in the amount of conductive polymer present in the polymer coating. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, it is submitted all pending claims (claims 1-21, 23-31) are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call Richard M. Klein, at telephone number 216-861-5582, Cleveland, OH.

It believed that no fee is due in conjunction with this response. If, however, it is determined that fees are due, authorization is hereby given for deduction of those fees, other than the issue fees, from Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH
& McKEE LLP



Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 861-5582